

REMARKS

The Applicant is most grateful for the Examiner's careful and thorough consideration of the previous amendments.

The Specification was objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduced new matter into the disclosure from the amendment of 11/1/2010. In response, Applicant has deleted the language which was objected to.

Claims 61-64 and 81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calfee (US 3,755,059) and Brookhart (US 3,989,789) and Hollis, Sr. (US 3,969,563). Further, claims 61-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calfee (US 3,755,059) and Chavannes (US 4,358,498) and in further view of Hollis, Sr. (US 3,969,563). Moreover, claims 61-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calfee (US 3,755,059) and Meyer (US 2,733,177) and in further view of Hollis, Sr. (US 3,969,563).

In response, Applicant has attached three Rule 1.132 Declarations that address the obviousness of the current claims. It is hoped that Applicant has now met the burden to provide evidence that an expanded mesh provides an improvement over prior art and unexpected results based on the combination of features.

Should the Examiner feel that there are further issues which may be resolved by means of telephone interview, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned.

No new matter has been entered.

Respectfully submitted,

/mlg/

Michael L. Greenberg, Esq.

Reg. no. 47312